

**Remarks**

This communication is considered fully responsive to the Office Action mailed January 31, 2006 and the Advisory Action mailed May 16, 2006. Claims 1-27 were examined. Claims 1-5, 8-11, and 25-27 stand rejected. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 12-24 are allowed. Claims 1 and 25 are amended. No claims are canceled. New claims 28 and 29 have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates that the Examiner has indicated claims 12-24 as being allowable, and claims 6 and 7 as containing allowable subject matter. New claim 28 includes all of the recitations of original claim 1 and claim 6. New claim 29 depends from new claim 28 and adds the recitations of original claim 7. Therefore, claims 28 and 29 are believed to be allowable.

**Amendments to put Remaining Claims in Condition for Allowance**

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner clarified his rejections of independent claims 1 and 25 and appeared to make suggestions for the Applicant to put these claims in condition for allowance.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that the carriage in Grant moves along the vertical rails and is therefore operatively connected to them - "the applicant does not claim they are driven by any particular element." The

Examiner also refers to Asakawa and states that "for something to move along relative to another object it need only move in a parallel path to the object."

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "said transfer shaft rotatable to drive said carriage along said at least one guide track through said first displacement path" (emphasis added). The vertical rails 34, 36 in Grant do not rotate to drive the platform 38. Nor does screw 6 in Asakawa rotate to drive along racks 21a and 21b.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-5 and 8-11 depend from claim 1 and therefore are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With regard to claim 25, the Examiner refers to Grant and states that "the first and second guide means disclosed by grant et al. [sic] interface through wheels (60), and those wheels for [sic] a rotating interface."

Applicant has amended claim 25 to recite "said second guide means rotating directly on said first guide means for moving said second guide means along said first guide means through the first displacement path" (emphasis added). The vertical rails 34, 36 in Grant do not rotate directly on the rails 46 and 48.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 25 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25. Claims 26-27 depend from claim 25 and therefore are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 25.

Conclusion

Applicant does not make any admissions regarding the rejections, and hereby expressly reserves the right to present further argument if any of the rejections are maintained in view of the amendments.

The Examiner is encouraged to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below if there are any final matters to put this case in condition for allowance. Otherwise, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6-15-2006

By: Mark D. Trenner

Mark D. Trenner  
Reg. No. 43,961  
(720) 221-3708